



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,777	02/25/2004	Daniel Louis Bates	213187/00008	3714

7590 05/23/2007  
Patent Administrator  
Suite 1600  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER
----------

XU, KEVIN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/23/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/786,777	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BATES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kevin K. Xu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It should be noted that the currently amended claim 1 is different from previously presented claim 12 because previously presented claim 12 merely recites "...object tracking system automatically compensates for changes in the color values of a pixel object due to lighting changes" (without explicit recitation of how these changes in the color values of said pixel object are determined or how these pixel objects are to be selected based on said changes) whereas currently amended claim 1 requires both "...object tracking system for *automatically determining* changes in the characteristics of said one or more pixel objects based upon changes in lighting and *automatically compensating* based on upon those changes." Thus, said amendment changes the scope of claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan (6198833) in view of Feinleib (6637032) in further view of Toyama (5204749).

In claim 1, Rangan teaches an image processing system for processing video content in a sequence of video frames and linking one or more pixel objects embedded

Art Unit: 2628

in said video content to selected data objects in a sequence of video frames by explaining a system is provided for tracking a moving entity in a video presentation, the system comprising a computer station presenting the video presentation on a display as a series of bitmapped frames; and a tracking module receiving the video data stream. (Col 3, lines 26-29); said image processing system comprising a **video capture** system for capturing a frame of said sequence of video frames to be viewed defining a captured video frame by showing a recording function for accepting the positions wherein the pixel signature (defined in the art as a local neighborhood around given pixel) most closely matches the image signature as the true positions of the image entity in the next frames. (Col 3, lines 43-46) and in FIG. 1 input data stream 15 to tracking module 13 is a stream of successive bitmapped frames in a normalized resolution, required by the tracking module. (Col 5, lines 35-37) The authoring station can be based on virtually any sort of computer platform and operating system, and in a preferred embodiment, a PC station running MS Windows is used, in which case the input stream 16, regardless of protocol, is converted to a digital video format that can be interpreted and played back as a sequence of bitmapped frames. (Col 5, lines 37-43) Furthermore Rangan teaches a user interface for enabling a user to select one or more pixel objects in said captured frame defining selected pixel objects. (Col 4 lines 11-35). Additionally Rangan teaches a pixel object tracking system, which includes a processor, which automatically tracks, said selected pixel objects in other frames. (Col 3, lines 26-50). It should be noted that it is well known in the art that a computer system would inherently contain a processor. Rangan also teaches said video linking system generating one or more

linked video files, separate from said video content (Col 6 lines 48-51, Col 10 lines 53-66) by explaining when tracking element 29 (Fig. 2) is positioned and activated over an image entity to be tracked, a signature table is created and stored (Col 8, lines 40-42) and upon tracking element 29 being activated the tracking module creates a table or list comprising pixel values associated with a target number and spatial arrangement of pixels associated with tracking element 29. (Col 7, lines 40-43). Although Rangan does not explicitly state the generation of video files, it is inherent to the invention that a table or list, which is created by the tracking module and subsequently stored, must implicitly require files for storage function. Lastly, Rangan teaches through additional editing processes, a moving region associated with the image entity in a display may be made to be interactive and identifiable to an end user. (Col 6, lines 55-57). Rangan further teaches user interaction with such an image entity during viewing of a video can be programmed to provide additional network-stored information about that a entity to suitable customer premises equipment (CPE) adapted to receive and display that information (Col 6, lines 57-62) and such further information may be displayed, for example, as an overlay on the display of the dynamic video containing the subject image entity. (Col 6, lines 62-64) It should be noted Rangan further teaches providing one or more links to predetermined data objects for each pixel object. (Col 7 lines 25-52, Fig. 2) Nonetheless, Rangan fails to explicitly teach said video linking system generating one or more linked video files separate from said video content, being configured to identify the pixel objects by frame number and location within the frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the

invention was made to utilize user editing processes and programmable capabilities of stored information about an image entity, as taught by Reagan, to identify the pixel objects by frame number and location within a frame because it is well known in the art that stored information about an image entity will include information about the image object's frame number and location within the frame in order to properly retrieve and display that information. Furthermore, these user programmable abilities allow advertisers, product promoters, or the like to present information to end users based on user interaction with an associate entity in a dynamic video display. (Col 6, lines 64-67) Reagan also teaches linked video files are synchronized with said video content. (Col 6, lines 48-51 and Col 10, lines 53-56) Furthermore Reagan teaches wherein said linked video files are configured so that selected locations in said video frames by a pointing device during playback of the video content can be linked with said data objects when said selected locations correspond said pixel objects. (Col 7 lines 35-52) It should be noted that the point device as taught by Reagan is a mouse. However, Reagan does not explicitly teach information **not embedded** in video content. This is what Feinleib teaches. (Col 3 lines 51-65, Col 9 lines 27-39, Col 11 lines 17-27) It should be noted that Feinleib teaches linked videos files for enhancing content separate from and not embedded in video content by teaching enhancing content may reside in a viewers home and is synchronized by a closed caption script of the primary content with the synchronization **independent** of how and when the enhancing content or primary content is delivered to the viewer computing units. (Col 6 lines 23-30) Again, Feinleib explicitly teaches enhancing content can be **delivered independently** of the primary

content and synchronized at the viewer-computing unit using the closed captioning script, which accompanies the primary content. (Col 9 lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine the teachings of generating one or more linked video files separate from and not embedded in video content into the system of Reagan because enhancements to primary content can be timely introduced at desired junctures of the primary content. (Col 2 lines 14-20) However neither Rangan nor Feinleib explicitly teaches automatically determining changes in the characteristics of said one or more pixel objects based on upon changes in lighting and automatically compensating based upon those changes. This is what Toyama teaches. (Col 3 lines 59-62, Col 13 line 40-Col 14 line 50, Fig. 9) It should be noted that Toyama teaches automatically detecting changes in the follow-up field of the object (automatically shifting color coordinate plane of values (R-Y/Y) and (B-Y/Y) from points A0, B0, C0 to A1, B1, C1 [Fig. 9]). Furthermore it should be noted that Toyama teaches said changes in the color difference signals are based on (accounting for) changes in lighting and also permits stable follow-up by automatically compensating for variations in luminance of the illuminating light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of automatically determining changes of one or more pixel objects based upon changes in lighting and automatically compensating for those changes into the system of Rangan because prevention of each of the points on the coordinate system from coming close to the origin or moving farther way from the origin (due to luminance of light varying with time) while the object is not moving can be

realized (Col 15 lines 48-54) and thus, stably performing a follow-up operation in despite of variations in luminance of illuminating light (Col 3 lines 59-62) can be achieved.

Regarding claim 11, Rangan teaches wherein said video playback application is configured to determine if selected locations by a pointing device during play back of the video content correspond to said predetermined pixel object and provide a link to a data object when said selected location corresponds to said predetermined pixel object which is similarly recited in the amended independent claim. (Col 7 lines 35-52)

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan (6198833) in view of Feinleib (6637032) in further view of Toyama (5204749) and Vidovic (3878557).

Consider claim 2, Rangan teaches a predetermined playback rate by showing in one preferred embodiment the subject video is displayed typically at 30 frames per second with a resolution of 352 by 240 pixels. (Col 5, lines 43-46) However, neither Rangan nor Feinleib explicitly teaches said video linking system samples said video content at a sample rate of less than said predetermined playback rate. This is what Vidovic teaches. Vidovic teaches a videotape recording apparatus, which shows color frame pulses separated by 66 milliseconds and have a 15Hz rate (Col 23, lines 56-57 and Fig 17B) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine a videotape recording apparatus **sampled** at 15Hz as taught by Vidovic with a video linking system displaying video at 30 frames per second as taught by Rangan in order to show the two possible phases



of the color frame reference pulses derived from the input color video signal (Col 23, lines 57-60 and Fig 17) and thus, to direct in choosing the correct phase. (Col 7, lines 54-55)

Consider claim 3, Vidovic does not explicitly define a sample rate of three frames per second. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to lower a 15 Hz sampling rate for videotape recording as taught by Vidovic to 3 Hz sampling rate because it is well known in the art that it is always practical to lower a sampling rate due to bandwidth or file size limitations.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan (6198833) in view of Feinleib (6637032) in further view of Toyama (5204749) and Toklu (6549643).

Regarding claim 4, the teachings of Rangan, Feinleib, Toyama are given in the previous paragraphs of this Office Action. However Rangan, Feinleib and Toyama do not explicitly teach said video linking system is configured to identify segment breaks in said video content. This is what Toklu teaches. Toklu teaches video summarization methods typically include segmenting a video into an appropriate set of segments such as video "shots" and selecting one or more key-frames from the shots. (Col 1, lines 34-37) It should be noted that a key-frame is defined in the art to be a frame used to indicate the beginning or end of a change made to the signal and therefore, an implied segment break. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine video summarization methods

configured to identify segment breaks as taught by Toklu with the image processing system as taught by Rangan in order to reduce the number of images to one or more key-frames to represent the content of a given shot (Col 1, lines 43-45) and thus, to generate a video summary. (Col 1, line 33).

Regarding claim 5, the teachings of Rangan, Feinleib, Toyama are given in the previous paragraphs of this Office Action. However Rangan, Feinleib and Toyama do not explicitly teach said segment breaks are determined by determining the median average pixel values for a series of frames and comparing changes in the pixel values relative to the median average and indicating a segment break when the change in pixel values represents at least a predetermined change relative to the median average. This is what Toklu teaches. Toklu teaches determining median average pixel values for a series of frames by showing computing an average of an absolute pixel-based intensity difference between consecutive frames in each segment, and for each segment, computing a cumulative sum of the average of the absolute pixel-based intensity differences for the corresponding frames of the segment. (Col 3, lines 61-67) Toklu also teaches comparing changes in pixel values relative to median average by explaining selecting the first frame in each motion activity segment of a given segment frame if the cumulative sum of the average of the absolute pixel-based intensity differences for the frames of the given segment does not exceed a first predefined threshold. (Col 4, lines 1-5) Lastly, Toklu teaches indicating a segment break when the change in pixel values represents at least a predetermined change relative to the median average by showing selecting a predefined number of key-frames in the given

segment uniformly, if the cumulative sum of the average of the absolute pixel-based intensity differences for the frames of the given segment exceeds the first predefined threshold. (Col 4, lines 5-9) It should be noted that a key-frame is defined in the art to be a frame used to indicate the beginning or end of a change made to the signal and therefore an implied segment break. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine determining the average pixel values for a series of frames, comparing changes in pixel values relative to the average and indicating a segment break when the change in pixel values represents at least a predetermined change relative to the median average as taught by Toklu with the image processing system as taught by Rangan in order to measure a temporal activity curve for dissimilarity based on frame differences. (Col 3, lines 60-62) and thus, make possible in the system and method for selecting key-frames from video data. (Col 3, lines 51-59)

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2628

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin K. Xu whose telephone number is 571-272-7747. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KX



Kevin Xu

MARK ZIMMERMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

5/16/07